(NASA-TM-84939) AXICNS ANC THE DARK MATTER OF THE UNIVERSE (NASA) 13 p HC A02/MF A01 CSCL 20H

N83-19585

Unclas

G3/72 08901

NASA

Technical Memorandum 84939

Axions and the Dark Matter of the Universe

R. Holman, G. Lazarides, and Q. Shafi

NOVEMBER 1982

National Aeronautics and
Space Administration

Goddard Space Flight Center
Greenbelt, Maryland 20771

Abstract

Spin(10) axion models are constructed which offer the intriguing possibility that axions comprise all or a significant part of the dark matter of the Universe.

Although axion models [1] can solve the strong CP problem, there are potential cosmological problems associated with them. One of these is the domain wall problem [2]. A discrete subgroup of the global, anomalous Peccei-Quinn (PQ) U(1) symmetry may remain unbroken by the QCD gluon anomaly [3]. This symmetry is then broken spontaneously and domain walls are formed. A second problem of axion models has been pointed out recently [4]. This problem has to do with the fact that since the axion couplings to matter have to be weak, the axions will essentially decouple as soon as they are produced. They may then give rise to an unacceptably large energy density in the present universe.

The analyses of ref. [4] imply that for axion models to be consistent with standard cosmology, the vacuum expectation value (vev) that breaks the PQ symmetry [f1] must be less than 10^{12} GeV [f2]. This clearly indicates that axion models must have intermediate mass scales, and rules out the simplest axion models based on SU(5) [6].

In this note, we give examples of models which have PQ symmetries which are broken at an intermediate scale. These models offer the intriguing possibility that axions comprise all or a significant portion of the dark matter of the Universe [4]. They also incorporate the solution of the domain wall problem devised in ref. [7]. The solution is to construct the PQ symmetry so that the action of the residual, discrete PQ symmetry coincides with the action of the center of the gauge group [f3]. The various domains then become gauge equivalent. In the process of spontaneous symmetry breaking, <u>hybrid strings</u> form which become the boundaries of a single domain wall that terminates on them. The string and wall system rapidly decays [8] and there is essentially no effect on standard cosmology.

We now proceed to construct our models. The gauge group is Spin (10) as

in ref. [7]. The fermion content is given by

$$\psi_{16}^{(i)}\ (i = 1,2,3) \quad , \quad \psi_{10}^{(\alpha)}\ (\alpha = 1,2) \quad , \qquad (1)$$

where the subscripts denote the dimension of the Spin (10) representation to which the various fields belong. The $U(1)_{PQ}$ transformation properties of the fermion fields are:

$$\psi_{16}^{(i)} \to e^{i\theta}\ \psi_{16}^{(i)}\ (i = 1,2,3),\ \psi_{10}^{(\alpha)} \to e^{-2i\theta}\ \psi_{10}^{(\alpha)}\ (\alpha = 1,2), \qquad (2)$$

and were chosen so that the residual, discrete PQ symmetry coincides with the center, Z_4, of Spin(10). If we had not included $\psi_{10}^{(\alpha)}$ ($\alpha = 1,2$), the residual PQ symmetry would be Z_{12}, which is, of course, too large to be embedded in Z_4 [9].

We first consider the following symmetry breaking chain of Spin(10) [f4]:

$$\text{Spin}(10) \xrightarrow[M_1]{210} SU_c(3) \times SU_L(2) \times SU_R(2) \times U(1)_{B-L} \xrightarrow{126},\xrightarrow[M_2]{45}$$

$$SU_c(3) \times SU_L(2) \times U(1)_Y \xrightarrow[M_W]{10} SU_c(3) \times U(1)_{EM}, \qquad (3)$$

where the Higgs fields necessary to implement this chain are as indicated. Under $U(1)_{PQ}$, the Higgs fields transform as follows:

$$\phi^{(210)} \to \phi^{(210)},\ \phi^{(126)} \to e^{2i\theta}\ \phi^{(126)},\ \phi^{(45)} \to e^{4i\theta}\phi^{(45)},\ \phi^{(10)} \to e^{-2i\theta}\phi^{(10)}. \qquad (4)$$

As in the fermion case, these $U(1)_{PQ}$ transformation properties ensure that the action of the residual PQ symmetry on these fields is identical to that of the center of Spin(10). Note that all Higgs fields except for $\phi^{(210)}$ are

complex.

The allowed Yukawa couplings are (in schematic form):

$$\psi_{16}\,\psi_{16}\,\phi^{(10)},\ \psi_{16}\,\psi_{16}\,\phi^{(126)+},\ \psi_{10}\,\psi_{10}\,\phi^{(45)}. \tag{5}$$

The allowed Higgs couplings include

$$\phi^{(210)}\phi^{(126)+}\phi^{(126)+}\phi^{(45)},\ \phi^{(210)}\phi^{(126)+}\phi^{(10)}\phi^{(45)},$$

$$\phi^{(210)}\ \phi^{(126)}\ \phi^{(10)}\ . \tag{6}$$

These couplings guarantee that $U(1)_{PQ}$ is the only global symmetry present. They also guarantee that $\phi^{(45)} \to -\phi^{(45)}$ is not a symmetry of the Lagrangian so that the domain wall problems associated with this symmetry can be avoided [12]. Now $\langle\phi^{(210)}\rangle$ cannot break $U(1)_{PQ}$ since it is neutral under $U(1)_{PQ}$. Hence $U(1)_{PQ}$ is broken at the intermediate scale M_2 by $\langle\phi^{(126)}\rangle$, $\langle\phi^{(45)}\rangle$. Both of these vev's are needed at this stage, since, if only one of them is used, then a linear combination of the $U(1)_{PQ}$ generator and B-L will remain unbroken.

We next use the one-loop renormalization group equations for the various coupling constants to calculate M_1 and M_2 in terms of $\sin^2\theta_W(M_W)$ and $\alpha_s(M_W)$. We also include the following Higgs contributions: [13] between M_2 and M_1 we include the (1, 1, 3, +1) and (1, 3, 1, -1) components of the 126, the (1, 3, 1, 0), (1, 1, 3, 0) components of the 45 and the (1, 2, 2, 0) components of the 10, where we have decomposed the Spin(10) representations under the subgroup $SU_c(3) \times SU_L(2) \times SU_R(2) \times U(1)_{1/2(B-L)}$. Between M_W and M_2 we only take the contribution of a single $SU_L(2)$ doublet (the Weinberg-Salam doublet). The fermions in the 10 acquire masses $\sim M_2$ and so contribute to the renormalization group equations between M_2 and M_1.

ORIGINAL PAGE IS
OF POOR QUALITY

We find that for $\sin^2\theta_w(M_w) \leq 0.21$, M_2 is too high to comply with the constraints of ref. [4]. Table 1 below shows how M_1 and M_2 vary as functions of $\sin^2\theta_w(M_w)$ and $\alpha_s(M_w)$. We have taken $\sin^2\theta_w(M_w) = 0.22, 0.23$ and $\alpha_s^{-1}(M_w) = 7.5, 8.0, 9.0.$[14)]

$\sin^2\theta_w(M_w)$	$\alpha_s^{-1}(M_w)$	M_2(GeV)	M_1(GeV)
0.22	7.5	$3.4\text{x}10^{12}$	$3.4\text{x}10^{15}$
0.22	8.0	$4.9\text{x}10^{12}$	$2.1\text{x}10^{15}$
0.22	9.0	$1.0\text{x}10^{13}$	$1.0\text{x}10^{15}$
0.23	7.5	$1.1\text{x}10^{11}$	$6.0\text{x}10^{15}$
0.23	8.0	$1.6\text{x}10^{11}$	$3.7\text{x}10^{15}$
0.23	9.0	$3.3\text{x}10^{11}$	$1.4\text{x}10^{15}$

Table 1: M_1 and M_2 as functions of $\sin^2\theta_w(M_w)$ and $\alpha_s^{-1}(M_w)$ for the chain of Eq (3).

We expect two-loop contributions to reduce M_1 and M_2 by a factor of 2-4. From Table 1 we see that there is a non-trivial range of values of $\sin^2\theta_w(M_w)$ and $\alpha_s(M_w)$ which are consistent with low energy experiments and allow us to satisfy the constraints of refs. [4, 5]. We also see that there are values of the parameters for which M_2/g saturates or nearly saturates its upper bound of 10^{12} Gev, where g is a typical gauge coupling constant. In this case, the axions of this model could comprise all or most of the dark matter of the Universe.[4)]

There are other intermediate symmetry groups that could have been used in place of $SU_c(3) \times SU_L(2) \times SU_R(2) \times U(1)_{B-L}$ in Eq (3). One of these is the

Pati-Salam subgroup [10] $SU_c(4) \times SU_L(2) \times SU(2)_R$. However, the mass scales in this case cannot satisfy the required constraints. Another subgroup is $SU_c(4) \times SU_L(2) \times U(1)_R$. In this chain, we use a combination of a real $\underline{45}'$ and a real $\underline{54}$ both with PQ charge zero to implement the first breaking (neither can do it alone). We also employ the same Higgs with the same PQ charges as in Eqs. (3, 4) to implement the remaining symmetry breakings. The fermions are as in Eqs. (1, 2), whereas the Higgs couplings include $54 \times 126^+ \times 126^+ \times 45$ and $54 \times 10 \times 10 \times 45$. Note that a $126^+ \times 126 \times 45'$ coupling exists which eliminates the domain wall problem associated with the $\underline{45}'$ which performs the first breaking. As in the previous chain, we have used the renormalization group equations to calculate M_1 and M_2 in terms of $\sin^2\theta_w(M_w)$ and $\alpha_s(M_w)$. We have included the following Higgs contributions: between M_2 and M_1 we include the $(\overline{10}, 1, -1)$ component of $\underline{126}$, the (15, 1, 0) component of $\underline{45}$ and (1, 2, 1/2) coming from $\underline{10}$. Between M_w and M_2 we include the Weinberg-Salam doublet only. The above decompositions are with respect to $SU_c(4) \times SU_L(2) \times U(1)_R$. Note that the fermions in the $\underline{10}$ contribute to the renormalization group equations between M_2 and M_1. The results for M_1 and M_2 for this chain are given in Table 2 below.

$\sin^2\theta_w(M_w)$	$\alpha_s^{-1}(M_w)$	M_2(Gev)	M_1(Gev)
0.22	7.5	3.5×10^{11}	2.0×10^{15}
0.22	8.0	6.2×10^{11}	1.3×10^{15}
0.22	9.0	1.9×10^{12}	5.7×10^{14}
0.23	7.5	3.7×10^{9}	2.6×10^{15}
0.23	8.0	6.6×10^{9}	1.7×10^{15}
0.23	9.0	2.0×10^{10}	7.2×10^{14}

Table 2: M_1 and M_2 as functions of $\sin^2\theta_w(M_w)$, $\alpha_s(M_w)$ with $SU_c(4) \times SU_L(2) \times U(1)_R$ as the intermediate symmetry group.

As in the previous case, we see that this pattern of symmetry breaking can also accomodate very nicely the bounds of refs. [4, 5]. We also see that axions can make up most or all of the dark matter of the Universe in this scheme too.

We now turn briefly to the phenomenology of the models discussed above. We expect that gauge boson mediated proton decay will occur in the model with a lifetime which can vary from $1\text{-}10^4$ times the SU(5) lifetime for the $SU_c(3) \times SU_L(2) \times SU_R(2) \times U(1)_{B-L}$ chain and from $1\text{-}10^2$ times the SU(5) lifetime for the $SU_c(4) \times SU_L(2) \times U(1)_R$ chain. We also note that if neutrinos acquire a mass through the mechanism of ref. [15], then as M_2 varies between 10^{12} GeV and 10^9 GeV, the heaviest neutrino in our models can have a mass ranging from 0.1 ev to 100 ev [f5]. Hence the dominant component of the dark matter of the Universe can vary from axions to neutrinos as M_2 varies between 10^{12} GeV and 10^9 GeV respectively. Finally, we note that the superheavy fermions $\psi_{10}^{(\alpha)}$, whose masses are of the order of M_2, will also contribute to the generation of baryon asymmetry.

To summarize, we have constructed Spin(10) axion models which are compatible with all known cosmological constraints. Moreover, they offer the possibility that the axions provide all, or a significant fraction of the dark matter of the Universe.

Acknowledgements

R. H. was supported by an NRC/NAS Posdoctoral Research Fellowship. The research of G. L. is partially sponsored by the Department of Energy, Grant No. DE-A CO2-82 ER 400033. B000. Q. S. would like to thank the NASA/Goddard Space Flight Center and especially Floyd Stecker for hospitality.

Footnotes

f1) Recall that axion couplings and masses are inversely propotional to this vev.

f2) Stellar evolution constraints [5]) demand that it be greater than 10^9 Gev.

f3) The center of the group is the subgroup which commutes with all elements of the group. The center of SU(N) is isomorphic to Z_n and that of Spin(4n+2) to Z_4.

f4) The group $SU_c(3) \times SU_L(2) \times SU_R(2) \times U(1)_{B-L}$ was first considered in ref. [10]. The chain in Eq (3) has been considered in connection with axion models in ref. [11]. However, the models of ref. [11] had the topological domain wall problem of ref. [3].

f5) Assuming a top-quark mass of ~ 20 GeV.

References

1. R. D. Peccei and H. Quinn, Phys. Rev. Lett. 38 (1977), 1440; S. Weinberg, Phys. Rev. Lett. 40 (1978), 223; F. Wilczek, Phys. Rev. Lett. 40 (1978), 279; J. Kim, Phys. Rev. Lett. 43 (1979), 103; M. Dine, W. Fischler and A. Srednicki, Phys. Lett. 104B (1981), 199.

2. T. W. B. Kibble, J. Phys. A9 (1976) 1387; Ya. B. Zel'dovich, I. Yu. Kobzarev and L. B. Okun, Soviet Physics JETP 40 (1975), 1.

3. P. Sikivie, Phys. Rev. Lett. 48 (1982), 1156.

4. J. Preskill, M. B. Wise and F. Wilczek, Harvard Preprint (1982); L. F. Abbott and P. Sikivie, Brandeis Preprint (1982).

5. D. A. Dicus, E. W. Kolb, V. L. Teplitz and R. V. Wagoner, Phys. Rev. D18 (1978), 1829.

6. M. B. Wise, H. Georgi and S. L. Glashow, Phys. Rev. Lett. 47 (1981), 402.

7. G. Lazarides and Q. Shafi, Phys. Lett. 115B (1982), 21.

8. T. W. B. Kibble, G. Lazarides and Q. Shafi, Phys. Rev. D26 (1982), 435. A. Everett and A. Vilenkin, Tufts Preprint (1982).

9. S. Barr, D. Reiss, and A. Zee, Phys. Lett. 116B (1982), 227; H. Georgi and M. B. Wise, Phys. Lett. 116B (1982), 123.

10. J. Pati and A. Salam, Phys. Rev. D10 (1974), 275.

11. R. N. Mohapatra, G. Senjanovic, Brookhaven Preprint (1982); D. Reiss, Phys. Lett. 109B (1982), 365.

12. G. Lazarides, Q. Shafi and T. Walsh, Nucl. Phys. B195 (1982), 157.

13. F. del Aguila and L. E. Ibanez, Nucl. Phys. B177 (1981), 60.

14. J. E. Kim, P. Langacker, M. Levine and H. H. Williams, Rev. Mod. Phys. 53 (1981), 211; P. Langacker, Phys. Rep. 72 (1981), 185; W. Marciano and A. Sirlin, Phys. Rev. Lett. 40 (1981), 163.

15. M. Gell-Mann, P. Ramond and R. Slansky in Supergravity, P. Van Nieuwenhuzen and D. Z. Freedman (eds), (North Holland 1979), 315.